


UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK



-----X
In re:

TERRORIST ATTACKS ON
SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

03-MD-01570 (GBD)(SN)

ORDER

-----X
SARAH NETBURN, United States Magistrate Judge:

This document relates to:

Ashton, et al. v. al Qaeda Islamic Army, et al., 02-cv-6977
Burlingame, et al. v. Bin Laden, et al., 02-cv-7230
Havlish, et al. v. Bin Laden, et. al., 03-cv-9848

Plaintiffs (the “Burlingame Plaintiffs”) in Ashton, et al. v. al Qaeda Islamic Army, et al., 02-cv-6977, and member case Burlingame, et al. v. Bin Laden, et al., 02-cv-7230, have filed supplemental materials at ECF Nos. 8240 and 8241 in support of their motion for default judgment against the Taliban at ECF No. 7678. This Motion was denied without prejudice to renew. ECF No. 7968. That denial noted its concern that the framing of the default judgment motion and its supporting papers were “a backdoor effort to seek an opinion on judgments sought or received by other parties in this case.” Id. at 2. It therefore denied the motion “without prejudice to renew through a motion with a properly limited scope.” Id.

While the Burlingame Plaintiffs have filed papers to supplement their original, denied motion, they have not filed a renewed motion so their default judgment request is not presently before the Court. In addition, any such renewed motion must comply with the requirements for default judgments against non-sovereign defendants set out by the Court’s order at ECF No. 8198. In particular, the Court directs the Burlingame Plaintiffs’ attention to the information that must be contained in supporting exhibits for each plaintiff under the rules at ECF No. 8198 at 4,

as well as the requirement that “[p]roposed orders granting default judgment must indicate that it is not binding on the determination of damages for defendants besides the one against whom default judgment is being sought.” Id. at 5.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 20, 2022
New York, New York


SARAH NETBURN
United States Magistrate Judge